

GENERALIZED SUPERMARTINGALE DEFLATORS UNDER LIMITED INFORMATION

CONSTANTINOS KARDARAS

ABSTRACT. We undertake a study of market viability from the perspective of a financial agent with limited access to information. The set of wealth processes available to the agent is structured with reasonable economic properties, instead of the usual practice of taking it to consist of stochastic integrals against a semimartingale integrator. We obtain the equivalence of the boundedness in probability of the set of terminal wealth outcomes with the existence of at least one strictly positive deflator that makes the deflated wealth processes have a generalized supermartingale property. Specializing to the case of full agent's information, we obtain as a consequence that in a viable market every properly discounted wealth processes has a version that is a semimartingale.

0. INTRODUCTION

An almost universal assumption in the literature of financial mathematics is that prices of traded assets, and as a byproduct wealth processes resulting from trading, are directly observable from an acting agent in the market. In mathematical terminology, one postulates that wealth processes are adapted with respect to the agent's filtration. In practice, however, it is not always reasonable to assume the agent's information flow is large enough to satisfy the previous requirement. This can model, for example, cases where information arrives to the agent with a delay, or in limited form. Additionally, it can model circumstances where there is lag between the decisions of the agent and their implementation; in that case, prices at the moment when the act is implemented are unknown at the moment when the decision is made.

The purpose of this work is to study market viability in scenarios like the ones described above. All wealth processes available to an agent with some fixed initial capital are modeled via an abstract set $\mathcal{X}$. The agent possesses some information stream under which the wealth processes are not necessarily adapted. The aforementioned set $\mathcal{X}$ is endowed with a reasonable economical structure, but it is *not* assumed to be generated by results of integrals against semimartingales. (To begin with, such an assumption would not make sense in our "limited information" set-up. Furthermore, the freedom we are allowing in the definition of a wealth-process set naturally allows for situations where infinite number of underlying assets are available for trading, as is for example the case in the theoretical modeling of bond markets.) The main result of this paper, Theorem 1.1, establishes

Date: January 21, 2010.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60G48; 91B70.

Key words and phrases. limited information; generalized supermartingales; boundedness in probability; arbitrages of the first kind; fundamental theorem of asset pricing.

the equivalence between the boundedness in probability of $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$, where T denotes a finite time-horizon, and the existence of at least one strictly positive process Y such that all deflated processes YX , where X ranges in $\mathcal{X}$, have some “generalized supermartingale” property under the agent’s filtration. Boundedness in probability of the set of terminal wealth processes has been discussed in great detail in [3], [5] and [6]; it is actually equivalent to a weak *market viability* condition, namely *absence of arbitrages of the first kind*, as is discussed in [9]. As it turns out, the correct description of a strictly positive deflator Y to be used in the aforementioned equivalence involves a “multiplicative” generalization of supermartingales. In the full-information case, meaning that wealth processes in $\mathcal{X}$ are observable to the agent, the latter generalization exactly reduces to the familiar supermartingale property.

Literature dealing with viability of markets when agents have limited information is scarce. To the best of the author’s knowledge, a treatment of this problem in a *continuous*-time setting has not appeared before. In [4], and for the case of discrete-time models, it was shown that the classical “No Arbitrage” condition is equivalent to the existence of a probability $\mathbb{Q}$, equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$, such that that optional projection (on the agent’s filtration) under $\mathbb{Q}$ of the discounted asset-prices are $\mathbb{Q}$ -martingales. In the latter paper, the authors argue that the question of viability for continuous-time models can be posed even for processes that are not semimartingales. It is then not hard to understand why such line of research does not seem very promising in continuous time: all the rich machinery of semimartingale theory cannot be directly used, since the processes involved might fail to be adapted with respect to the agent’s filtration. Indeed, a portion of the work carried out in this paper deals with establishing appropriate generalizations of well-known results, such as Doob’s nonnegative supermartingale convergence theorem, in order to achieve the goal of proving the main result. In this sense, this paper also contributes to the general theory of stochastic processes.

As a side note, we also discuss an important implication that our main result has in the full-information case. Namely, we obtain that boundedness in probability of $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ implies that *every* wealth processes in $\mathcal{X}$, when appropriately discounted, has a semimartingale modification.

The structure of the paper is simple: in Section 1 all the results are stated, while Section 2 contains the somewhat lengthy and technical proof of the main Theorem 1.1.

1. THE RESULTS

1.1. Probabilistic notation and definitions. All stochastic elements in the sequel are defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathcal{G}$ is a σ -field over Ω and $\mathbb{P}$ is a probability on $(\Omega, \mathcal{G})$. Fix some $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ that models the end of financial activity. We consider a right-continuous filtration $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ holds for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\mathcal{F}_0$ is trivial modulo $\mathbb{P}$. We assume that $\mathcal{G}$ is $\mathbb{P}$ -complete and all $\mathbb{P}$ -null sets of $\mathcal{G}$ are contained in $\mathcal{F}_0$; in other words, the stochastic basis satisfies the usual hypotheses.

We stress that the stochastic processes that will be considered in what follows are *not* assumed to be $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted; by a “stochastic process X ” we simply mean a collection $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that, for each $t \in [0, T]$, X_t is a $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable random variable.

By $\mathbb{L}_+^0$ we shall be denoting the set of all equivalence classes (modulo $\mathbb{P}$) of nonnegative, $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable random variables, endowed with the metric topology of convergence in $\mathbb{P}$ -measure. (Note that we shall not differentiate between random variables and the equivalence class in $\mathbb{L}_+^0$ they generate.) Furthermore, we shall use $\mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ to denote the set of $f \in \mathbb{L}_+^0$ such that $\mathbb{P}[f > 0] = 1$.

A stochastic process X will be called *nonnegative* if $X_t \in \mathbb{L}_+^0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$; X will be called *strictly positive* if $X_t \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. A nonnegative stochastic process X will be called *cád in probability* if the mapping $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto X_t \in \mathbb{L}_+^0$ is right-continuous. Further, a nonnegative process X will be called *cádlág in probability* if the mapping $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto X_t \in \mathbb{L}_+^0$ is right-continuous and admits left-hand limits. Note that these notions are weaker than the corresponding “cád” and “cádlág” notions referring to the paths of a process.

1.2. Generalized supermartingales. For a nonnegative process Z , we now introduce a “supermartingale” property with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ that takes into account the fact that Z might not be $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted. A *nonnegative* stochastic process Z will be called a *generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$* if $\mathbb{E}[Z_t/Z_s \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ holds whenever $s \in [0, T]$ and $t \in [s, T]$. As the event $\{Z_s = 0\} \in \mathcal{G}$ might not be $\mathbb{P}$ -null for $s \in [0, T]$, one should be careful in defining Z_t/Z_s on $\{Z_s = 0\}$. We use the following conventions: on $\{Z_s = 0, Z_t > 0\}$ we set $Z_t/Z_s = \infty$, while on $\{Z_s = 0, Z_t = 0\}$ we set $Z_t/Z_s = 1$. In particular, if Z is a nonnegative generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$, then $\mathbb{P}[Z_s = 0, Z_t > 0] = 0$ holds whenever $s \in [0, T]$ and $t \in [s, T]$.

If a nonnegative process Z is $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted, it is straightforward to check (using our division conventions) that Z is a generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}[Z_t \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq Z_s$ holds whenever $s \in [0, T]$ and $t \in [s, T]$; in other words, we retrieve the usual definition of nonnegative supermartingales.

1.3. The equivalence result. We are ready to state the main result of the paper, which connects the boundedness in probability of the terminal values of a set of wealth processes to the existence of a strictly positive generalized supermartingale deflator. Theorem 1.1 below, whose proof is given in Section 2, refines and widens the scope of previous findings obtained in the “full information” case, like the ones in [2] and [6].

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a set of stochastic processes such that:*

- (a) *Each $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is nonnegative and cádlág in probability, and satisfies $X_0 = 1$.*
- (b) *There exists a strictly positive process $\overline{X} \in \mathcal{X}$.*
- (c) *$\mathcal{X}$ is convex: $((1 - \alpha)X + \alpha X') \in \mathcal{X}$ holds for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $X' \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.*

(d) $\mathcal{X}$ has the following switching property: for all $\tau \in [0, T]$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$, all $X \in \mathcal{X}$, and all strictly positive $X' \in \mathcal{X}$, the process

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbb{I}_{\Omega \setminus A} X + \mathbb{I}_A \frac{X'_\tau}{X_\tau} X_{\tau \wedge \cdot} = \begin{cases} X_t(\omega), & \text{if } t \in [0, \tau[, \text{ or } \omega \notin A; \\ (X_\tau(\omega)/X'_\tau(\omega)) X'_t(\omega), & \text{if } t \in [\tau, T] \text{ and } \omega \in A \end{cases}$$

is also an element of $\mathcal{X}$.

Then, the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) The set $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is bounded in probability: $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}[X_T > \ell] = 0$.
- (2) There exists a càdlàg in probability and strictly positive process Y such that YX is a generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Under any of the above equivalent conditions, each $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is càdlàg in probability.

If $\mathcal{X}$ is such that (a) through (d) are satisfied and furthermore $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is closed in probability, conditions (1) and (2) above are also equivalent to:

- (3) There exists a strictly positive wealth process $\hat{X} \in \mathcal{X}$, such that $X/\hat{X}$ is a generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

1.4. Remarks on Theorem 1.1.

1.4.1. Financial interpretation of the set $\mathcal{X}$. A set $\mathcal{X}$ that satisfies (a) through (d) in the statement of Theorem 1.1 can be thought as modeling the wealth processes that are available to some agent in a financial market. Condition (a) states that the initial capital of the agent is normalized to unit, and that wealth processes satisfy an extremely mild “regularity” requirement. Condition (b) states that one can find a wealth process in $\overline{\mathcal{X}} \in \mathcal{X}$ that can be used as a “baseline” to denominate all other wealths — for this reason, it has to be strictly positive. (Usually, $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ is taken to be the wealth process generated by the bank account.) Note that if we choose to actually denominate all wealths in units of $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$, in other words if we replace $\mathcal{X}$ by $\overline{\mathcal{X}} := \{X/\overline{\mathcal{X}} \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$, then properties (a) through (d) of Theorem 1.1 still hold for the new wealth-process set $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ with (b) actually strengthened to $1 \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}$. Further, note that a process Y satisfies statement (2) of Theorem 1.1 if and only if the process $\overline{Y} := Y\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ satisfies statement (2) of Theorem 1.1 with $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ replacing $\mathcal{X}$. This simple “change of numéraire” trick helps reduce the proof of Theorem 1.1 to the case where property (b) is strengthened to $1 \in \mathcal{X}$. Moving ahead, it is intuitively clear why the convexity property (c) should hold: if an agent can invest in two wealth processes $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $X' \in \mathcal{X}$, the agent should be free to allocate at time $t = 0$ a fraction $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ of the unit initial capital to wealth X' and the remaining fraction to the wealth X . The switching property (d) has the following economic interpretation: if an agent can invest in two wealth streams $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $X' \in \mathcal{X}$, where the latter process is assumed strictly positive, we should then allow for the possibility that, starting with the wealth process X , at time τ the agent decides to either switch to the wealth process X' , which happens on $A \in \mathcal{F}_\tau$, or keep investing according to X , on the event $\Omega \setminus A$. Note that it is exactly condition (d) which reflects that the information flow available to the agent is $\mathbf{F}$.

1.4.2. *Adaptedness of the strictly positive generalized supermartingale deflator.* As a careful inspection of the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 2 reveals, the strictly positive generalized supermartingale deflator Y that satisfies condition (2) of Theorem 1.1 can be chosen to be adapted with respect to the usual augmentation of the filtration that makes all the wealth processes in $\mathcal{X}$ adapted. In particular, if the processes in $\mathcal{X}$ are $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted, Y can be chosen to be $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted.

1.4.3. *The numéraire in $\mathcal{X}$.* When $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is bounded in probability and closed in probability, it is natural to call a process $\hat{X}$ that satisfies condition (3) of Theorem 1.1 above *the numéraire* in $\mathcal{X}$, which generalizes the definition for the full information case (see [10], [1], [6]). Note, however, that $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ will be closed in probability only in very special cases. A particular but important such case occurs when $\mathcal{X}$ consists of all processes of the form $X^\theta = 1 + \int_0^\cdot \sum_{i \in I} \theta_t^i dS_t^i$, where I is a finite set, each S^i , $i \in I$ is a nonnegative $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingale, and θ ranges over all $\mathbb{R}_+^I$ -valued $\mathbf{F}$ -predictable processes such that $\sum_{i \in I} \theta_t^i S_{t-}^i \leq X_{t-}^\theta$ holds for all $t \in [0, T]$. In that case, the boundedness in probability of $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is enough to ensure that the latter set is closed in probability as well. This last fact was established (in a slightly different form) in [3].

1.4.4. *On a generalization of Doob's supermartingale convergence theorem.* It is interesting to note that the càd in probability structure of the strictly positive supermartingale deflator Y , as well as the “regularization in probability” that is obtained for the wealth processes in $\mathcal{X}$ that appear in Theorem 1.1, are based on a generalization of the celebrated result by Doob on the convergence of nonnegative supermartingales. In fact, we obtain a version of the last result for processes that are generalized supermartingales with respect to smaller filtrations than the ones making the processes adapted. Mathematically, the weakest assumption one can impose of the generalized supermartingale structure is, of course, when the filtration is trivial. This result seems new (the author was not able to spot any such occurrence in the literature) and its proof does not use “traditional” methods and tools of martingale theory. We elaborate further on this discussion at Remark 2.5.

1.5. **More on the full-information case.** We conclude with a treatment of the case where the wealth processes in $\mathcal{X}$ in the statement of Theorem 1.1 are actually $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted. We shall show that boundedness in probability of $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ has profound implications on the structure of the processes in $\mathcal{X}$.

Recall that a process X is called *càdlàg* if the outer probability of the complement of the event where the mapping $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto X_t$ is right-continuous and has left-hand limits is zero.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is a set of processes satisfying conditions (a) through (d) of Theorem 1.1. Furthermore, assume that each process in $\mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted and that $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is bounded in probability. Fix some strictly positive wealth process $\bar{X} \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$, the “discounted” process $X/\bar{X}$ has a modification that is an $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingale.*

Proof. By replacing $\mathcal{X}$ by $\{X/\bar{X} \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$, we may, and shall, assume that $1 \in \mathcal{X}$. Under this assumption, we need to show that every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ has a modification that is an $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingale.

As $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is bounded in probability, pick Y as in condition (2) of Theorem 1.1. According to §1.4.2, Y can be chosen to be $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted; we shall then assume that indeed Y is $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted from now on. Pick any $X \in \mathcal{X}$; then, YX is an $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted nonnegative generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$, i.e., a nonnegative $\mathbf{F}$ -supermartingale. The mapping $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Y_t X_t] \in [0, T]$ is right-continuous: indeed, this follows from the fact that YX is a càd in probability nonnegative $\mathbf{F}$ -supermartingale (with $Y_0 X_0$ being a strictly positive constant) by a straightforward application of Fatou's lemma. In particular, since YX is $\mathbf{F}$ -adapted, and in view of the standard supermartingale modification result (see for example Proposition 1.3.14 of [7]), YX has a càdlàg modification for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, which we shall denote by Z^X . Since Z^X is a càdlàg $\mathbf{F}$ -supermartingale, it is in particular an $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingale.

Applying the above observation for $X = 1 \in \mathcal{X}$, we get that Z^1 is a modification of Y that is a càdlàg $\mathbf{F}$ -supermartingale. Since $\mathbb{P}[Z_t^1 > 0] = \mathbb{P}[Y_t > 0] = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and Z^1 is a càdlàg $\mathbf{F}$ -supermartingale, we obtain the stronger $\mathbb{P}[\inf_{[0, T]} Z_t^1 > 0] = 1$. In particular, the process $1/Z^1$ is well-defined and Itô's formula implies that is an $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingale.

Now, fix $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and write $X = (1/Y)(YX)$. Consider the process $(1/Z^1)Z^X$, which is obviously a modification of X . As both processes $(1/Z^1)$ and Z^X are $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingales, we conclude that X has a modification Z^X/Z^1 , which is a $\mathbf{F}$ -semimartingale. $\square$

Theorem 1.2 above has a flavor of the celebrated Bichteler-Dellacherie Theorem, as it is connecting boundedness in probability of the terminal values of the processes in $\mathcal{X}$ with the semimartingale property of the processes in $\mathcal{X}$ themselves. In the case where $\mathcal{X}$ is generated by results of simple integrands with respect to a given *locally bounded càdlàg process*, a version of Theorem 1.2 can be found in [3]. The important difference in our treatment is that $\mathcal{X}$ is not consisting of outcomes of simple integrals (either of unit-bounded predictable integrands in the case of the Bichteler-Dellacherie Theorem, or of predictable integrands that lead to stochastic integrals that are uniformly bounded below by a given constant in the case of [3]) against a given integrator process, but rather a set of stochastic processes with specific economically-motivated properties; in particular, no underlying finite-dimensional asset-price process is stipulated from the outset.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We first state and prove a “static” version of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_+^0$ with $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0 \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is convex and closed in probability. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *$\mathcal{C}$ is bounded in probability: $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{P}[f > \ell] = 0$.*
- (2) *There exists $g \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[gf] \leq 1$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$.*
- (3) *There exists $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[f/\hat{f}] \leq 1$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. The difficult implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is the content of Theorem 1.1 (statement 4) in [8]. Implication (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) trivially follows by setting $g := 1/\hat{f}$. Finally, assume (2) and fix $g \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ such

that $\mathbb{E}[gf] \leq 1$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$. For all $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}$, $\ell \mathbb{P}[fg > \ell] \leq \mathbb{E}[fg] \leq 1$. Therefore, $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{P}[fg > \ell] \leq \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} (1/\ell) = 0$, i.e., $\{fg \mid f \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is bounded in probability. Since $g \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$, $\mathcal{C}$ is also bounded in probability. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ with $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0 \neq \emptyset$ be convex and closed in probability. An element $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying condition (3) of Theorem 2.1 above will be called the *numéraire in $\mathcal{C}$* . A straightforward application of Jensen's inequality implies that if the numéraire in $\mathcal{C}$ exists, it is unique. The result of Theorem 2.1 says in effect that $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded in probability if and only if the numéraire in $\mathcal{C}$ exists.

We proceed with stating and proving two results of independent interest that will help establish Proposition 2.4, a result concerning regularization of generalized supermartingales.

Lemma 2.2. *Consider two $\mathbb{L}_+^0$ -valued sequences $(g^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(h^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathbb{E}[g^n] \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[h^n] \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g^n h^n) = 1$. Then, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g^n = 1 = \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^n$.*

Proof. The fact that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g^n h^n) = 1$ implies that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{g^n h^n} = 1$; then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{g^n h^n} \right] \right) = 1 - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{g^n h^n} \right] \leq 0,$$

as follows from Fatou's Lemma. Now, since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sqrt{g^n} - \sqrt{h^n} \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[g^n] + \mathbb{E}[h^n] - 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{g^n h^n} \right] \leq 2 \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{g^n h^n} \right] \right),$$

we obtain that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sqrt{g^n} - \sqrt{h^n} \right) = 0$. In view of $g^n - h^n = (\sqrt{g^n} - \sqrt{h^n})(\sqrt{g^n} + \sqrt{h^n})$ and the fact that both sequences $(g^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(h^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are bounded in probability (because $\mathbb{E}[g^n] \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[h^n] \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$), we also have $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g^n - h^n) = 0$. Furthermore, the equality $g^n + h^n = (\sqrt{g^n} - \sqrt{h^n})^2 + 2\sqrt{g^n h^n}$ gives $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g^n + h^n) = 2$. Finally, combining $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g^n - h^n) = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g^n + h^n) = 2$ gives $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g^n = 1 = \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^n$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, let $\mathcal{C}^n$ be a convex, closed and bounded subset of $\mathbb{L}_+^0$ with $\mathcal{C}^n \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0 \neq \emptyset$, and let $\hat{f}^n$ be the numéraire in $\mathcal{C}^n$. (These numéraires hold in view of Theorem 2.1.) Then, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}^n = \hat{f}^\infty$ holds in either of the following cases:*

- (1) $(\mathcal{C}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is nondecreasing and $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ is the closure in probability of $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}^n$.
- (2) $(\mathcal{C}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is nonincreasing and $\mathcal{C}^\infty = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}^n$.

Proof. In the course of the proof below we drop all superscripts “ ∞ ” to ease the readability. To establish both statements (1) and (2) below, we shall just show the existence of a subsequence $(\hat{f}^{m_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(\hat{f}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}^{m_n} = \hat{f}$. By the same argument, it will follow that *any* subsequence of $(\hat{f}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a *further* subsequence that converges to $\hat{f}$. Since $\mathbb{L}_+^0$ is equipped with a metric topology, this will imply that the whole sequence $(\hat{f}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\hat{f}$.

Proof of (1). Lemma A.1 from [3] gives the existence of a sequence $(\tilde{f}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that each $\tilde{f}^n$ is a convex combination of $(\hat{f}^k)_{k=n, \dots, m_n}$ for some $n \leq m_n \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that $\tilde{f} := \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}^n$ exists. Of course, $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}$. Obviously, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n = \infty$; we can also assume that $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence, forcing it to be if necessary.

Since $\mathbb{E}[f/\hat{f}^k] \leq 1$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^n$ and $n \leq k$, Jensen's inequality applied by using the convex function $]0, \infty[\ni x \mapsto 1/x \in]0, \infty[$ implies that $\mathbb{E}[f/\tilde{f}^k] \leq 1$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^n$ and $n \leq k$. By Fatou's lemma, $\mathbb{E}[f/\tilde{f}] \leq 1$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^n$. In particular, $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$. As $(\mathcal{C}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is nondecreasing and $\mathcal{C}$ is the $\mathbb{L}^0$ -closure of $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}^n$, Fatou's lemma applied once again will give $\mathbb{E}[f/\tilde{f}] \leq 1$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$. By uniqueness of the numéraire, we get $\tilde{f} = \hat{f}$. Since $\hat{f} \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$, it follows that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{f}^n/\hat{f}) = 1$.

Since $\hat{f}^{m_n}$ is the numéraire in $\mathcal{C}^{m_n}$ and $\tilde{f}^n \in \mathcal{C}^{m_n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}^n/\hat{f}^{m_n}] \leq 1$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, $\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}^{m_n}/\hat{f}] \leq 1$ is obvious because $\hat{f}$ is the numéraire in $\mathcal{C}$. Letting $g^n := \tilde{f}^n/\hat{f}^{m_n}$ and $h^n := \hat{f}^{m_n}/\hat{f}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the conditions of the statement of Lemma 2.2 are satisfied. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^n = 1$, which exactly translates to $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}^{m_n} = \hat{f}$.

Proof of (2). One applies again Lemma A.1 from [3] to get the existence of a sequence $(\tilde{f}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that each $\tilde{f}^n$ is a convex combination of $(\hat{f}^k)_{k=n, \dots, \ell_n}$ for some $n \leq \ell_n \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that $\tilde{f} := \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}^n$ exists. We can assume that $(\ell_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence, forcing it to be if necessary. Following the same reasoning as in the proof of case (1) one can show that $\tilde{f} = \hat{f}$.

Define $m_0 = 1$ and a $\mathbb{N}$ -valued increasing sequence $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ inductively via $m_n = \ell_{m_{n-1}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, it is straightforward to check that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}^{m_n}/\tilde{f}^{m_{n-1}}] \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}^{m_n}/\hat{f}^{m_n}] \leq 1$ hold for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Letting $g^n := \hat{f}^{m_n}/\tilde{f}^{m_{n-1}}$ and $h^n := \tilde{f}^{m_n}/\hat{f}^{m_n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the conditions of the statement of Lemma 2.2 are satisfied. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h^n = 1$, which, in view of $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}^{m_n} = \hat{f}$ gives $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}^{m_n} = \hat{f}$. $\square$

The next result concerns the “regularization in probability” of processes and is the analogue of path regularization of nonnegative supermartingales (see, for example, Proposition 1.3.14 of [7]). Before the statement of Proposition 2.4, we introduce some notation. Fix a nonnegative process $X \in \mathcal{X}$. For $s \in [0, T[$, if $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_{t^n}$ exists and is the *same* for any *strictly* decreasing $[0, T]$ -valued sequence $(t^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t^n = s$, we shall be denoting this common limit by $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \downarrow s} X_t$. By definition, we set $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \downarrow T} X_t = X_T$. Similarly, if $t \in]0, T]$ and $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_{s^n}$ exists and is the *same* for any *strictly* increasing $[0, T]$ -valued sequence $(s^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s^n = t$, we shall be denoting this latter limit by $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{s \uparrow t} X_s$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let Z be a strictly positive generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$. Then, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $Z_{t+} := \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{\tau \downarrow t} Z_\tau$ exists. If $\tau \in]0, T]$, $Z_{\tau-} := \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} Z_t$ exists as well. Furthermore, $(Z_{t+})_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a strictly positive generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$, and $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} Z_{t+}$ exists and is equal to $Z_{\tau-}$ for all $\tau \in]0, T]$.*

Proof. For $t \in [0, T]$, let $\mathcal{C}_t$ be the closed (in probability) convex hull of $\{Z_\tau \mid \tau \in [t, T]\}$. It follows that $\mathcal{C}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}_s$ whenever $s \in [0, T]$ and $t \in [s, T]$. Also, Z_t is the numéraire in $\mathcal{C}_t$, since $\mathbb{E}[Z_\tau/Z_t] \leq 1$ whenever $t \in [0, T]$ and $\tau \in [t, T]$. In particular, in view of Theorem 2.1, $\mathcal{C}_t$ is bounded in probability for all $t \in [0, T]$.

For all $t \in [0, T[$, let $\mathcal{C}_{t+} := \bigcup_{\tau \in]t, T]} \mathcal{C}_\tau$, as well as $\mathcal{C}_{T+} := \mathcal{C}_T$. For all $t \in [0, T]$, $\mathcal{C}_{t+} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_t$, and $\mathcal{C}_{t+} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_{\tau^n}$ holds for any *strictly* decreasing $[0, T]$ -valued sequence $(\tau^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau^n = t$

whenever $t \in [0, T[$. An application of Lemma 2.3 gives that $Z_{t+} := \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{\tau \downarrow t} Z_\tau$ exists for all $t \in [0, T]$ and it is actually equal to the numéraire in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+}$ will denote the closure in probability of $\mathcal{C}_{t+}$. (Observe that the numéraire in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+}$ exists by Theorem 2.1, as $\mathcal{C}_{t+} \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+}$ is convex and bounded in probability.)

Consider now the process $Z_{\cdot+} := (Z_{t+})_{t \in [0, T]}$. Since $\mathcal{C}_{t+} \cap \mathbb{L}_{++}^0 \neq \emptyset$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and Z_{t+} is the numéraire in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+}$, it follows that $Z_{t+} \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$, i.e., $Z_{\cdot+}$ is strictly positive. We claim that $Z_{\cdot+}$ is càdlàg in probability; indeed, for $t \in [0, T[$, and as $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+}$ coincides with the closure in probability of $\bigcup_{\tau \in]t, T]} \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau+}$, an application of Lemma 2.3(1) gives that $Z_{t+} = \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{\tau \downarrow t} Z_{\tau+}$. Now, for all $\tau \in]0, T]$ we have $\bigcap_{t \in [0, \tau[} \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{t+} = \bigcap_{t \in [0, \tau[} \mathcal{C}_t$. An application of Lemma 2.3(2) gives that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} Z_{t+}$ and $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} Z_t$ exist, and they are actually equal.

It only remains to show that $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t+}/Z_{s+} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ holds whenever $s \in [0, T]$ and $t \in [s, T]$. Fix $s \in [0, T]$ and $t \in [s, T]$, as well as $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $s^n := (1 - 1/n)s + T/n$ and $t^n := (1 - 1/n)t + T/n$, the generalized supermartingale property of Z with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ and the fact that $A \in \mathcal{F}_s \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{s^n}$ give $\mathbb{E}[(Z_{t^n}/Z_{s^n})\mathbb{I}_A] \leq \mathbb{P}[A]$. Then, Fatou's lemma gives $\mathbb{E}[(Z_{t+}/Z_{s+})\mathbb{I}_A] \leq \mathbb{P}[A]$. Since $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ was arbitrary we get $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t+}/Z_{s+} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$. $\square$

Remark 2.5. Here, we take up on the topic of §1.4.4, on the generalization of Doob's supermartingale convergence theorem. For simplicity, we discuss the case where the time-set is discrete, i.e., the process is indexed by $\mathbb{N}$. The extension to $\mathbb{R}_+$ -indexed processes is straightforward.

Let $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an $\mathbb{L}_+^0$ -valued sequence of random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[g_n/g_m] \leq 1$ holds whenever $\mathbb{N} \ni m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that the convex hull of $\{g_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded away from zero in probability. Following the ideas in the proof of Proposition 2.4 — more precisely, using statement (2) of Lemma 2.3 — we can obtain that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n$ exists. To compare this result with the nonnegative supermartingale convergence theorem, let $\mathcal{H}_n$ denote the smallest σ -field that makes all random variables $g_1, \dots, g_n$ measurable. Doob's well-known result states that if $\mathbb{E}[g_n \mid \mathcal{H}_m] \leq g_m$ holds whenever $\mathbb{N} \ni m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n$ $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. exists. Rewrite the supermartingale property $\mathbb{E}[g_n \mid \mathcal{H}_m] \leq g_m$ as $\mathbb{E}[g_n/g_m \mid \mathcal{H}_m] \leq 1$, and note in particular that $\mathbb{E}[g_n/g_m] \leq 1$ whenever $\mathbb{N} \ni m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. (This is just the generalized supermartingale property of $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under the trivial filtration.) Therefore, the supermartingale convergence theorem becomes a special case of our result, since we use no conditioning in the generalized supermartingale property of $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Of course, one can no longer claim that $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., and this is one of the reasons why only a regularization “in probability” is obtained in Proposition 2.4.

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We show the implications (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3), (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2), and (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) below. The fact that all processes in $\mathcal{X}$ are càdlàg in probability is established at the end of the proof of implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). As discussed in §1.4.1, we can, and shall, assume that property (b) of the set $\mathcal{X}$ in the statement of Theorem 1.1 is strengthened into $1 \in \mathcal{X}$.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). For all $t \in [0, T]$, let $\mathcal{C}_t := \{X_t \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$. The convexity of $\mathcal{X}$ implies that $\mathcal{C}_t$ is convex for all $t \in [0, T]$. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$. The switching property of $\mathcal{X}$, combined with $1 \in \mathcal{X}$ gives that $\tilde{X} := X_{t\wedge\cdot}$ is also in $\mathcal{X}$; since $\tilde{X}_T = X_t$, we obtain that $\{X_t \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\} \subseteq \{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}_t$ is bounded in probability for all $t \in [0, T]$. From Theorem 2.1 it follows that, for all $t \in [0, T]$, there exists $\hat{f}_t$ in the closure in probability of $\mathcal{C}_t$ such that $\mathbb{E}[f/\hat{f}_t] \leq 1$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}_t$.

Now, let $(\xi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\xi_T^n \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_T^n = \hat{f}_T$. We shall show that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_t^n = \hat{f}_t$ actually holds for all $t \in [0, T]$. Fix $t \in [0, T]$ and let $(\chi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\chi_t^n \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \chi_t^n = \hat{f}_t$. We can assume without loss of generality that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t^n/\chi_t^n] \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. (Indeed, if the latter fails we can replace χ^n with ψ^n , an appropriate convex combination of χ^n and ξ^n , such that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t^n/\psi_t^n] \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\chi_t^n/\psi_t^n] \leq 1$ hold for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$; in effect, ψ^n is the numéraire in $\{(1-\alpha)\chi_t^n + \alpha\xi_t^n \mid \alpha \in [0, 1]\}$. Lemma 2.2 with $g^n := \chi_t^n/\psi_t^n$ and $h^n = \psi_t^n/\hat{f}_t$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ implies that this new $\mathcal{C}_t$ -valued sequence $(\psi_t^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ will still converge to $\hat{f}_t$.) Now, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\zeta^n := \chi_{t\wedge\cdot}^n(\xi_{t\vee\cdot}^n/\xi_t^n)$. We have $\zeta^n \in \mathcal{X}$ by the switching property, and $\zeta_T^n = (\chi_t^n/\xi_t^n)\xi_T^n$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\xi_T^n/\zeta_T^n] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_t^n/\chi_t^n] \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. An application of Lemma 2.2 with $g^n := \xi_T^n/\zeta_T^n$ and $f^n := \zeta_T^n/\hat{f}_T$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ gives $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_T^n = \hat{f}_T$. Combining this with $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \chi_t^n = \hat{f}_t$, we get $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\xi_t^n/\xi_T^n) = \hat{f}_t/\hat{f}_T$, and, therefore, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_t^n = \hat{f}_t$, which is the claim we wished to establish.

Define $\hat{Y}_t := 1/\hat{f}_t$ for all $t \in [0, T]$; as $\hat{f}_t \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$, $\hat{Y}$ is a well-defined and strictly positive process. We claim that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n - 1|] = 0$ holds for each $t \in [0, T]$. Indeed, since $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n) = 1$ and $(\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n) \in \mathbb{L}_+^0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by Theorem 16.14(ii), page 217 in [11] one needs to establish that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n] = 1$, which follows from $1 = \mathbb{E}[\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n] \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n] \leq 1$. In particular, for all $A \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n \mathbb{I}_A] = \mathbb{P}[A]$.

Fix $s \in [0, T]$, $t \in [s, T]$, $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ and a strictly positive $X \in \mathcal{X}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tilde{X}^n := \mathbb{I}_{\Omega \setminus A} \xi^n + \mathbb{I}_A (\xi_s^n/X_s) X_{s\vee\cdot}$. The switching property of $\mathcal{X}$ implies that $\tilde{X}^n \in \mathcal{X}$. Furthermore, $\tilde{X}_t^n = \mathbb{I}_{\Omega \setminus A} \xi_t^n + \mathbb{I}_A (\xi_s^n/X_s) X_t$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_t^n \hat{Y}_t] \leq 1$ translates to the inequality $\mathbb{E}[(X_t/X_s) \hat{Y}_t \xi_s^n \mathbb{I}_A] \leq 1 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\Omega \setminus A} \hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n]$. Using Fatou's lemma on the left-hand side of this inequality and the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\Omega \setminus A} \hat{Y}_t \xi_t^n] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[A]$ on the right-hand-side, we obtain

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_t \hat{Y}_t}{X_s \hat{Y}_s} \mathbb{I}_A \right] \leq \mathbb{P}[A].$$

Since $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ was arbitrary, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[X_t \hat{Y}_t / (X_s \hat{Y}_s) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ for all strictly positive $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Since $1 \in \mathcal{X}$, using Proposition 2.4 with $Z := \hat{Y}$ we obtain a strictly positive generalized supermartingale Y with respect to $\mathbf{F}$, such that $Y_0 = 1$ and $Y_t = \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{\tau \downarrow t} \hat{Y}_\tau$ holds for all $t \in [0, T]$. Fix $s \in [0, T]$, $t \in [s, T]$, $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ and a strictly positive $X \in \mathcal{X}$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $s^n := (1 - 1/n)s + T/n$ and $t^n := (1 - 1/n)t + T/n$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and since $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$, we have $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{Y}_{t^n} X_{t^n} / (\hat{Y}_{s^n} X_{s^n})) \mathbb{I}_A] \leq \mathbb{P}[A]$ by (2.1). As X is càd in probability, Fatou's lemma gives $\mathbb{E}[(Y_t X_t / (Y_s X_s)) \mathbb{I}_A] \leq \mathbb{P}[A]$. Since $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ was arbitrary we obtain $\mathbb{E}[Y_t X_t / (Y_s X_s) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ for all strictly positive $X \in \mathcal{X}$. We have to show that the last inequality actually holds also for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$, not necessarily strictly positive. Fix then $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $X^n := (1/n) + (1 - 1/n)X$ for

all $n \in \mathbb{N}$; then, $X^n \in \mathcal{X}$ and X^n is strictly positive. It follows that $\mathbb{E}[Y_t X_t^n / (Y_s X_s^n) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (X_t^n / X_s^n) = (X_t / X_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{X_s > 0\}} + \mathbb{I}_{\{X_s = 0, X_t = 0\}} + \infty \mathbb{I}_{\{X_s = 0, X_t > 0\}}$. As $\mathbb{E}[\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (Y_t X_t^n / (Y_s X_s^n)) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ holds by the conditional version of Fatou's lemma, and $\mathbb{P}[Y_s > 0, Y_t > 0] = 1$, we obtain $\mathbb{P}[X_s = 0, X_t > 0] = 0$. Then, using the division conventions mentioned in §1.2, we get $\mathbb{E}[Y_t X_t / (Y_s X_s) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq 1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. In other words, YX is a nonnegative generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). The implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of Theorem 2.1, applied to the set $\mathcal{C} := \{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ (which is assumed closed) implies that there exists $\hat{X} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[X_T / \hat{X}_T] \leq 1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. We shall show that $X / \hat{X}$ is a nonnegative generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. The proof of implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) above shows that $\mathbb{E}[X_t / \hat{X}_t] \leq 1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in [0, T]$; in particular, $\hat{X}$ is strictly positive. Using the notation of the proof implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), it is clear that $\hat{X} = 1 / \hat{Y}$. Then, the result follows directly from (2.1).

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Set $\hat{Y} := 1 / \hat{X}$. A priori, $\hat{Y}$ is not necessarily càdlàg in probability. Then, pass to Y as in the proof of implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) above and follow the rest of the argument.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Pick Y with the properties of statement (2). For all $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have the inequality $\ell \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}[Y_T X_T > \ell] \leq \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[Y_T X_T] \leq 1$. Therefore, the set $\{Y_T X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is bounded in probability. Since $Y_T \in \mathbb{L}_{++}^0$, $\{X_T \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is bounded in probability.

Finally, we show that if Y is a process satisfying condition (2) of Theorem 1.1, all wealth processes in $\mathcal{X}$ are càdlàg in probability. Pick $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $X' = (1 + X)/2$; then $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ and X' is strictly positive. It follows that YX' is a strictly positive generalized supermartingale with respect to $\mathbf{F}$. According to Proposition 2.4, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} (Y_t X'_t)$ exists for all $\tau \in]0, T]$; as $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} Y_t$ also exists and is an element of $\mathbb{L}_{++}^0$, we obtain that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} X'_t$ exists for all $\tau \in]0, T]$. This is equivalent to saying that $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{t \uparrow \tau} X_t$ exists for all $\tau \in]0, T]$. Since X is already càd in probability, we conclude that X is càdlàg in probability. □

REFERENCES

- [1] D. BECHERER, *The numeraire portfolio for unbounded semimartingales*, Finance Stoch., 5 (2001), pp. 327–341.
- [2] M. M. CHRISTENSEN AND K. LARSEN, *No arbitrage and the growth optimal portfolio*, Stoch. Anal. Appl., 25 (2007), pp. 255–280.
- [3] F. DELBAEN AND W. SCHACHERMAYER, *A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*, Math. Ann., 300 (1994), pp. 463–520.
- [4] Y. KABANOV AND C. STRICKER, *The Dalang-Morton-Willinger theorem under delayed and restricted information*, in In memoriam Paul-André Meyer: Séminaire de Probabilités XXXIX, vol. 1874 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 2006, pp. 209–213.
- [5] Y. M. KABANOV, *On the FTAP of Kreps-Delbaen-Schachermayer*, in Statistics and control of stochastic processes (Moscow, 1995/1996), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1997, pp. 191–203.
- [6] I. KARATZAS AND C. KARDARAS, *The numeraire portfolio in semimartingale financial models*, Finance Stoch., 11 (2007), pp. 447–493.

- [7] I. KARATZAS AND S. E. SHREVE, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, vol. 113 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1991.
- [8] C. KARDARAS, *Numéraire-invariant preferences in financial modeling*. To appear in the Annals of Applied Probability, 2009.
- [9] ———, *Finitely additive probabilities and the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*. To appear in Contemporary Quantitative Finance, 2010.
- [10] J. B. LONG, JR., *The numéraire portfolio*, Journal of Financial Economics, 26 (1990), pp. 29–69.
- [11] D. WILLIAMS, *Probability with martingales*, Cambridge Mathematical Textbooks, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

CONSTANTINOS KARDARAS, MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS DEPARTMENT, BOSTON UNIVERSITY, 111 CUMMINGTON STREET, BOSTON, MA 02215, USA.

E-mail address: kardaras@bu.edu